

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 18, 2007 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), claims 1-7, 9-23 and 25-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-18, 20, 23, 26 and 28-33 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

I. Claims 1-7, 9-23 and 25-33 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-7, 9-23 and 25-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,876,640 to Bertrand et al. (hereinafter, "Bertrand"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Id. (citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, "the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims at issue are patentably distinct from Bertrand. Bertrand does not disclose all of the subject matter in these claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein a connection identifier corresponds to a Packet Coordination Function (PCF) that has been previously visited by the wireless communication device." Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' Specification, for example, page 5, paragraph [1024] and page 6, paragraph [1027]. Bertrand does not disclose this subject matter.

The Office Action asserts that a Radio Network (RN) of Bertrand discloses "a Packet Coordination Function." (See Office Action, page 7.) The Office Action further asserts that an International Mobile Station Identifier (IMSI) of Bertrand discloses "a connection identifier." (See Office Action, page 6.) However, Bertrand does not disclose that the connection identifier

“corresponds to a . . . (PCF) that has been previously visited by the wireless communication device.”

Instead Bertrand states:

The PDSN 120(1) will then inquire of the PPP register 126(1) to determine whether the PPP register 126(1) has stored a unique identifier, such as, for example, an International Mobile Station Identifier (IMSI), for the mobile station 102(1).

Bertrand, col. 6, lines 10-14.

An International Mobile Station Identifier (IMSI) does not disclose “a connection identifier [that] corresponds to a Packet Coordination Function (PCF).” Rather, the IMSI “allow[s] the system 100 to uniquely identify the mobile station.” (Id. col. 6, lines 15-16.) A mobile station does not disclose “a Packet Coordination Function (PCF).” As previously stated, the Office Action asserts that the “Packet Coordination Function” is disclosed by the radio network (RN) of Bertrand. (See Office Action, page 6.)

In addition, the unique identifiers of the mobile station (e.g. IMSI) “are indexed so that a lookup can be performed to determine whether a PPP context for a particular mobile station has been stored.” (Id. col. 6, lines 17-19.) Bertrand does not disclose that the unique identifiers of the mobile station “correspond[] to a Packet Coordination Function (PCF) that has been previously visited by the wireless communication device.”

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Bertrand. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 2-6 are patentably distinct from Bertrand. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite “wherein a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device correspond to each of the connections and wherein the first timer is set to expire after the second timer.” Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants’ Specification, for example, page 13, paragraph [1048]. Bertrand does not disclose this subject matter.

Instead, Bertrand states

If the R-P connection between the RN 108(2) and the PDSN 120(2) expires while the PDSN 120(2) is serving the mobile station 102(1), the PDSN 120(2) sends a message to the PPP register 126(1) directing the PPP register 126(1) to remove the PPP context of the mobile unit 102(1) (including its IMSI) so that the system 100 will know to completely negotiate the next PPP session involving the mobile station 102(1).

Bertrand, col. 7, lines 32-39.

The Office Action asserts that the above cited passage of Bertrand discloses “[t]he Packet Data Serving Node (PDSN) . . . comprising a plurality of timers corresponding to the plurality of stored connections.” (See Office Action, page 10.) However, simply determining “[i]f the R-P connection between the RN 108(2) and the PDSN 120(2) expires while the PDSN 120(2) is serving the mobile station 102(1)” does not disclose “a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device [that] correspond to each of the connections.” Further, Bertrand does not disclose that the timer of the PDSN is required “to expire after the second timer [of the wireless communication device].” Regarding the PDSN, Bertrand requires the following:

Only the PDSN that last made a successful query of the PPP register regarding a particular PPP context (e.g., the PDSN 120(2)) is permitted to remove that PPP context from the PPP register 126(1). This prevents a PPP context from being removed by a PDSN that had been serving a mobile station prior to a handover of the mobile station (e.g., the PDSN 120(1)) to another PDSN (e.g., the PDSN 120(2)).

Bertrand, col. 7, lines 40-45.

The requirement to only allow the PDSN that last made a successful query of the PPP register to remove PPP context from the PPP register does not disclose “the first timer [of the PDSN] is set to expire after the second timer [of the wireless communication device].”

Bertrand further states the following:

If the PPP register 126(1) does not hear from any PDSN on behalf of the mobile station 102(1) for a predetermined amount of time, an expiration timer (not shown) expires and the PPP register 126(1) automatically removes the stored PPP context for the mobile station 102(1) from its database.

Bertrand, col. 7, lines 51-56.

Simply disclosing the existence of “an expiration timer” does not disclose “a first timer in the PDSN and a second timer in the wireless communication device correspond to each of the connections and wherein the first timer is set to expire after the second timer.” There is no

disclosure that this “expiration timer” is in both the PDSN and the wireless communication device and that the timer in the PDSN is “set to expire after the second timer” that is in the wireless communication device.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentably distinct from Bertrand. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 9-15 be withdrawn.

Claim 16 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 17 depends directly from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 19 depends directly from claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claims 21 and 22 depend directly from claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 23 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 7. As such, Applicants submit that claim 23 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 7.

Claim 25 depends directly from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claim 26 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 27 depends directly from claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

Claim 28 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 28 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 29 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 7. As such, Applicants submit that claim 29 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 7.

Claim 30 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 30 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 31 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 32 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 7. As such, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 7.

Claim 33 has been amended with subject matter similar to the subject matter amended to claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentably distinct from Bertrand for at least the same reasons as those stated above in connection with claim 1.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 31, 2007

By: /Kam T. Tam/
Kam T. Tam, Reg. No. 35,756
Phone No. (858) 651-5563

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-5563
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502